

U.S. Patent Application Serial No. 10/088,488  
Response to Office Action dated September 13, 2006

**REMARKS**

Claims 1, 2, 4, 6 and 7 are pending in this application, of which claims 1, 4 and 6 have been amended. Claims 3 and 5 have been canceled. No new claims have been added.

Claims 1-5 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by Howard et al.

Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

In Applicants' last response, it was argued that Howard et al. fails to disclose that the client key 314 (client ID) is incorporated into the contents file (document 303). Although the Examiner has disagreed with this view, close review of paragraph [0042] discloses that the browser 312 sends the client key 314 to the server computer 301. The server computer 302 "determines if a client key is associated with the request." There is no disclosure that the client key 314 is contained in document 303, as is required in the claimed invention (using the corresponding terminology of "client ID" and "contents file" recited in exemplary claim 1).

Furthermore, paragraph [0042] fails to disclose that both a client ID and a user ID are incorporated in the contents file ("document 303") for security matching purposes, as recited in claims 3 and 5, depending from claims 1 and 4, respectively.

Accordingly, claims 3 and 5 have been canceled and their limitations have been added to claims 1 and 4, respectively.

Thus, the 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) rejection should be withdrawn.

Claims 6 and 7 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Howard et al. in view of U.S. Patent Publication 2005/0210101 to Janik (hereafter, "Janik").

U.S. Patent Application Serial No. 10/088,488  
Response to Office Action dated September 13, 2006

Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Janik, like Howard et al., discussed above, fails to teach, mention or suggest the features recited in claim 4, as amended, from which claim 6 depends.

Thus, the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection should be withdrawn.

In view of the aforementioned amendments and accompanying remarks, claims 1, 2, 4, 6 and 7, as amended, are in condition for allowance, which action, at an early date, is requested.

If, for any reason, it is felt that this application is not now in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to contact Applicants' undersigned attorney at the telephone number indicated below to arrange for an interview to expedite the disposition of this case.

In the event that this paper is not timely filed, Applicants respectfully petition for an appropriate extension of time. Please charge any fees for such an extension of time and any other fees which may be due with respect to this paper, to Deposit Account No. 01-2340.

Respectfully submitted,

ARMSTRONG, KRATZ, QUINTOS,  
HANSON & BROOKS, LLP  
  
William L. Brooks  
Attorney for Applicant  
Reg. No. 34,129

WLB/ak  
Atty. Docket No. 020392  
Suite 1000  
1725 K Street, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20006  
(202) 659-2930



23850

PATENT TRADEMARK OFFICE